

## **UTILIZATION OF BENEFITS FROM GOVERNMENT PROGRAMMES BY IRRIGATED AND RAINFED FARMERS IN CHIKKABALLAPUR DISTRICT OF KARNATAKA- AN COMPARITIVE ANALYSIS**

**PRADEEPA BABU B N<sup>1</sup>, MAHESHA M<sup>2</sup> & RAJKUMAR B J<sup>3</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Institute for Social and Economic Change (ISEC), Bangalore, Karnataka, India

<sup>2</sup>Department of Studies in Economics and Co-operation, University of Mysore, Karnataka, India

<sup>3</sup>Department of Dairy Economics, Karnataka Veterinary, Animal and Fisheries Sciences University,  
Bidar, Karnataka, India

### **ABSTRACT**

This study attempts to assess the utilization of benefits from governmental programmes /schemes among irrigated and rainfed farmers in Karnataka in Karnataka. For this study, a sample of 120 farmers who have access to irrigation and who are totally dependent on rainfall have been randomly sampled in Chikkaballapur districts of Karnataka. Cent per cent of the small and marginal farmers under irrigated situation were getting benefit from BPL card. This in itself is a prima-facie indicator of receiving at least the basic food supply. Therefore, the provision of food security is adequately taken care of by the Government. Under irrigated situation in the marginal farmers category, a beneficiary family derived on an average Rs.58, 626.96 by participating in 9 development programs of which maximum benefit was from MGNREGS (24.95%). Under rainfed situation in the marginal farmers category a beneficiary family derived on an average of Rs.46, 443.96 and participated in 9 development programs of which maximum benefit was from BPL card (15.62%). This shows importance of BPL card for the marginal farmers. Under irrigated situation, in the small farmers category a beneficiary family derived on an average of Rs. 61,029.96 and participated in 9 development programs of which maximum benefit was from the schemes of Department of Agriculture (27.43%) followed by MGNREGS (19.17%). In the case of rainfed situation in the small farmers category, a beneficiary family derived on an average of Rs.44,316.96 and participated in 9 development programs of which maximum benefit was from MGNREGS (29.92%) followed by BPL card (15.14%). Under irrigated situation in the medium farmers category, a beneficiary family derived on an average Rs.47,466.96 by participating in 9 development programs of which maximum benefit was from Agriculture Department (23.47%) followed by BPL card (14.09%). Under rainfed situation, in the medium scale farmers category, a beneficiary family derived on an average Rs.40,067.96 by participating in nine development programs of which maximum benefit was from MGNREGS (20.68%) followed by Bhagyalakshmi investment bond program (16.65%). Under irrigated situation, in the large farmers category a beneficiary family derived on an average of Rs.37,955.21 and participated in 7 development programs of which maximum benefit was from schemes of Agriculture Department (23.30%) followed by Bhagyalakshmi investment bond program (17.57%). Under rainfed situation, in the large farmers category, a beneficiary family derived on an average of Rs.35,672.96 and participated in 9 development programs of which maximum benefit was from BPL ration card (19.49%) followed by old age pension scheme (16.82%). In a nutshell, all categories of irrigated area farmers derived more benefits compared to rainfed area farmers in Chikkaballapur district.

**KEYWORDS:** Government Programs, Rainfed farmers, Irrigated Farmers, Rural Development Programs, Small and Marginal farmers, Medium and Large farmers

## INTRODUCTION

Rural developmental schemes play a greater role among developing nations like India, where a large part of the population lives in rural areas. Successive Governments chalk out programs devoting planned funds for the welfare of the people. Since independence there have been umpteen number of programs launched for the welfare of rural people. Considering the contemporary economic growth parameters and the perception of the development practitioners, different programs were shaped at different stages of economic development. Rural development programs in India primarily targeted on provision of basic necessities, poverty alleviation, better livelihood opportunities and infrastructure facilities through self-employment generation. However, due to inefficient delivery systems, most of these programs do not reach the targeted poor.

The rural poor face a range of problems which disturb their survival and quality of life. These problems can be grouped into four categories. They are: 1) Livelihood: a. scarcity of food b. shelter and c. small holdings; 2) Health: which includes lack of access to primary health centres and issues related to nutritional security; 3) Education: which includes lack of access to schools and 4) Social development. Among all these, problems of livelihood are more stupendous and most of the programs are designed by the Central Government and implemented by the state Governments targeted to improve the livelihood of the rural poor.

The Government of Karnataka has implemented several rural development programs like Anna Bhagya scheme, 'Bhagyalakshmi scheme-for girl child protection', 'Yashaswini-health insurance scheme', and 'Kaliyuva makkalige free cycle' for students studying in high schools. The Government programs which are mainly focusing on women are; SHG loans and subsidies, Widow Pension and Bhagyalakshmi Scheme. Efforts were made to quantify the benefits received the sample farmers in the study area.

## OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- To measure the impact of Government rural development schemes on livelihood security across different types of farmers

### Hypotheses Developed for the Above Objective

- Utilization of benefits from Government programs by rainfed farmers is greater compared to irrigated farmers

## METHODOLOGY

This study is conducted in two scenarios (1) Irrigated situation (2) Rainfed situation. Accordingly three staged random sampling procedure was used for the selection of respondents, on the first phase two taluks were selected, in second phase based on the reconnaissance survey 6 villages in each taluk were considered for selecting the farmers deriving at least one government benefits. In the third phase from each selected village, 10 farmers were randomly selected. To address the objectives set forth for the study, primary data were collected from 120 randomly selected farmers for the period 2012-13. The data pertaining to rural development schemes was obtained from the sample households through personal interviews. Secondary data related to Government schemes were collected from Rural Development

Department. For the purpose of achieving the objectives of the study, data were analyzed using tabular presentation, averages and proportions were specially used to estimate the utilization of benefits from governmental programmes.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The respondents were post-stratified into marginal, small, medium and large farmers based on the size of operational holding. The number of respondents under different categories in Chikkaballapur is presented in Table 1. The distribution of operational holdings was highly skewed in the study area. The marginal farmers operate on an average of 2.04 acres and 1.37 acres under irrigated and rainfed situations respectively, as against 12.89 acres and 11.25 acres by large farmers. The farmland owned consists of a number of small fragments with different mix of enterprises along with crops, dairy and small ruminants. The average size of land holdings of irrigated area farmers (6.31 acres) was more compared to rainfed area farmers (5.65 acres), this might be due to better investment capacity and risk bearing ability of irrigated area farmers. The age distribution pattern of sample respondents indicates that, the average age of the respondents was higher in rainfed situation (50.50 years) as compared to irrigated situation (47.75 years). In general, younger farmers are better risk takers as they invest on irrigation facilities like bore wells, drip irrigation and sprinkler irrigation. Further, the awareness about the Government programs is more among young farmers who also have more contacts with extension agents. The education status of the respondents in Chikkaballapur (Table 2) indicated that, out of the total farmers under irrigated situation, only one farmer (1.67 %) is illiterate as compared to 11 farmers (18.33%) in rainfed situation. It can be inferred that education helps farmers to avail the benefits from Government programs and also to take greater risks in farming like digging costly bore wells. The success rate of which is very low in Chikkaballapur district due to over exploitation of ground water.

**Table 1: Socio-economic Profile of Sample Farmers in Chikkaballapur District**

Particulars	Marginal		Small		Medium		Large		Total	
	I	R	I	R	I	R	I	R	I	R
No. of farmers	13	19	16	15	15	13	16	13	60	60
Avg. Size of holdings	2.04	1.37	3.38	3.75	6.93	6.23	12.89	11.25	6.31	5.65
Avg. Age of respondents	45.00	54.00	45.00	47.00	52.00	51.00	49.00	50.00	47.75	50.50

**Note:** I-Irrigated; R-Rainfed.

**Table 2: Educational Status of Sample Farmers in Chikkaballapur District**

Education Level	Marginal		Small		Medium		Large		Total	
	I	R	I	R	I	R	I	R	I	R
Illiterate	0	6	1	3	0	1	0	1	1 (1.67)	11 (18.33)
Primary	2	4	1	2	1	0	1	2	5 (8.33)	8 (13.33)
Middle	4	3	4	2	5	1	4	1	17 (28.33)	7 (11.67)
Secondary	2	3	5	5	8	6	6	6	21 (35.00)	20 (33.33)
PUC	2	1	1	2	0	2	3	1	6 (10.00)	6 (10.00)
Graduate and above	3	2	4	1	1	3	2	2	10 (16.67)	8 (13.33)
<b>Total</b>	<b>13 (10.8)</b>	<b>19 (15.83)</b>	<b>16 (13.33)</b>	<b>15 (12.50)</b>	<b>15 (12.50)</b>	<b>13 (10.83)</b>	<b>16 (13.33)</b>	<b>13 (10.83)</b>	<b>60 (100.00)</b>	<b>60 (100.0)</b>

**Note:** 1) I-Irrigated; R-Rainfed.

2) Figures in parentheses are percentage of farmers to the total.

### Extent of Utilization of Benefits of Different Programs by Farm Households under Irrigated and Rainfed Situation

Generally the development programs are more focused towards welfare of the intended households. The number of farm households availing benefit through various programs under irrigated situation under Chikkaballapur district is presented in Table 3. Cent per cent of the small and marginal farmers under irrigated situation were getting benefit from BPL card. This in itself is a prima-facie indicator of receiving at least the basic food supply. Therefore, the provision of food security is adequately taken care of by the Government. Interestingly, two large farmers found to have BPL card due to procedural lapse and false documentation. About 40 per cent of the medium scale farmers and 88 per cent of the large farmers were deriving benefits from APL card which indicates their social esteem. Only 6.67 per cent of the large farmers and 6.25 per cent of the medium scale farmers children were deriving benefits from mid-day meal program. Due to higher level of incomes children of the large and medium scale farmers were sent to study in private schools. None of the large and medium scale farmers' children received bicycles from Kaliyuva Makkalige Bicycle program. Because most of the children of medium scale and large farmers were sent to private schools to pursue high school education in English medium. All categories of sample respondents (marginal, small, medium and large farmers) under irrigated situation were getting benefits from old age pension scheme. None of the marginal farmers received Bhagya Lakshmi Investment Bond for their girl child. Interestingly, 18.75 per cent of the small farmers received benefits under this scheme, due to better educational status of small farmers under irrigated situation in Chikkaballapur district. About 30.77 per cent of the marginal farmers and 31.25 per cent of the small farmers were deriving benefits from Indira Awas Yojana (IAY). All categories of farm households derived benefits from Horticulture Department.

About 23 per cent of the farmers who received benefits from Department of Horticulture were marginal farmers. Relatively more numbers of medium scale (53.33%) and large (56.25%) farmers were deriving benefits from Department of Agriculture as compared to small (43.75%) and marginal farmers (30.77%). This indicates medium scale and large farmers were having better social contacts and use better agricultural inputs. About 20 per cent of the medium scale farmers and 31 per cent of the large farmers were getting subsidy for sprinkler and drip irrigation facilities under Micro irrigation schemes because most of them grow vegetables. None of the marginal farmers derived benefits under micro irrigation scheme. Since marginal farmers were not having sprinkler and drip irrigation facilities because of the need for huge investment. More than 65 per cent of the farmers in all the categories were having Yashasvini cards. This is mainly due to well established milk producers co-operative societies in Chikkaballapur district. In Karnataka, only members in co-operatives are eligible to get the Yashasvini health card. About 23 per cent of the marginal farmers and 25 per cent of the small farmers were getting wages under Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee act. Interestingly, 6.67 per cent of the medium scale farmers having job cards though they are not eligible. This was mainly due to procedural lapse, false documentation and clout in panchayats.

Table 4 presents the number of farm households availing benefit through various programs under rainfed situation in Chikkaballapur district. All marginal, small and medium scale categories of sample farm households in rainfed situation were getting benefit from the BPL card. Although most of the large farmers were not eligible for getting benefit under BPL card, two large farmers were deriving benefits by producing false documents. About 85 per cent of the large farmers were deriving benefits from APL card, thus indicating their social esteem. All categories of sample respondents' children (marginal, small, medium scale and large farmers) were getting benefits from mid-day meal program. Only 7.69 per cent of the large farmers' children were deriving benefits from mid-day meal program, because most of the large farmers in the

area under study sent their children to private schools. Around 11 per cent of the marginal farmers, 13.33 per cent of the small farmers, 7.69 per cent of the medium scale and large farmers' children were deriving benefits from Kaliyuva Makkalige Bicycle program.

Relatively larger numbers of large farmers (31%) were deriving benefits from old age pension scheme compared to marginal farmers (22%), small farmers (20%) and medium scale farmers (23%). This indicates better social network of the large farmers. About 11 per cent of the marginal farmers, 13 per cent of the small farmers, 8 per cent of the medium scale and large farmers derived benefits from Bhagya Lakshmi investment bond. Around 42 per cent of the marginal farmers were derived benefits from (IAY). Although large farmers were not eligible for getting benefit under IAY program, one large farmer was found to derive benefits due to procedural lapse and false documentation. Greater percentage of large farmers (30.77%) deriving benefits from schemes of Horticulture Department is due to their better social contacts compared to marginal farmers (10.53%), small farmers (20%) and medium scale farmers (7.69%). About 26 per cent of the marginal farmers, 40 per cent of the small farmers 46 per cent of the medium scale farmers and 54 per cent of large farmers were deriving benefits from the Department of Agriculture by way of subsidy on inputs. Generally, under rainfed situation large farmers purchase larger quantities of inputs (seeds and chemical fertilizers) from the Agriculture Department because of their capacity to use these inputs. More than 60 per cent of the farmers in all the categories were having Yashasvini cards. This is mainly due to membership in well established milk producers co-operative societies in Chikkaballapur district. About 37 per cent of the marginal farmers, 27 per cent of the small farmers and 15 per cent of the medium scale farmers were getting 100 days employment under Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme. The wage rate (Rs.194/person) under NREGA is less than the prevailing agricultural wages (on an average Rs.230/person plus meals) in Chikkaballapur district. Further, delays have been reported in payment of wages (payment is made once in 15 days).

#### **Benefit to Farmers from Development Programs under Irrigated and Rainfed Situations 2013-14**

The extent of benefits derived by the farm households from various development programs under irrigated and rainfed situations in Chikkaballapur district is presented in Tables 5 and 6. Under irrigated situation in the marginal farmers category, a beneficiary family derived on an average Rs.58, 626.96 by participating in 9 development programs of which maximum benefit was from MGNREGS (24.95%). Under rainfed situation in the marginal farmers category a beneficiary family derived on an average of Rs.46, 443.96 and participated in 9 development programs of which maximum benefit was from BPL card (15.62%). This shows importance of BPL card for the marginal farmers. Under irrigated situation, in the small farmers category a beneficiary family derived on an average of Rs. 61,029.96 and participated in 9 development programs of which maximum benefit was from the schemes of Department of Agriculture (27.43%) followed by MGNREGS (19.17%). In the case of rainfed situation in the small farmers category, a beneficiary family derived on an average of Rs.44,316.96 and participated in 9 development programs of which maximum benefit was from MGNREGS (29.92%) followed by BPL card (15.14%). Under irrigated situation in the medium farmers category, a beneficiary family derived on an average Rs.47,466.96 by participating in 9 development programs of which maximum benefit was from Agriculture Department (23.47%) followed by BPL card (14.09%). Under rainfed situation, in the medium scale farmers category, a beneficiary family derived on an average Rs.40,067.96 by participating in nine development programs of which maximum benefit was from MGNREGS (20.68%) followed by Bhagyalakshmi investment bond program (16.65%). Under irrigated situation, in the large farmers category a beneficiary family derived on an average of Rs.37,955.21 and

participated in 7 development programs of which maximum benefit was from schemes of Agriculture Department (23.30%) followed by Bhagyalakshmi investment bond program (17.57%). Under rainfed situation, in the large farmers category, a beneficiary family derived on an average of Rs.35,672.96 and participated in 9 development programs of which maximum benefit was from BPL ration card (19.49%) followed by old age pension scheme (16.82%). In a nutshell, all categories of irrigated area farmers derived more benefits compared to rainfed area farmers in Chikkaballapur district. The findings of the present study are in consonance with earlier study (Sowndarya, 2012) where she reported that, the farm households underground water irrigated situation were realized higher benefits of Rs.13,676 by participating in 7 government programs compared to those under rainfed situation (Rs.11,606 by participating in 9 government programs). It was hypothesized in the study that rainfed area farmers are utilizing relatively more benefits from development programs than irrigated area farmers. Thus the above hypothesis is rejected.

**Table 3: Number of Irrigated Farm Households Getting Benefit from Government Programs in Chikkaballapur District in 2013**

Name of the Program/Scheme	Marginal Farmers	Small Farmers	Medium Farmers	Large Farmers
BPL Ration Card	13 (100.00)	16 (100.00)	11 (73.33)	2 (12.50)
APL Ration Card	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	4 (40.00)	14 (87.50)
Mid-Day Meal Scheme	2 (15.38)	4 (25.00)	1 (6.67)	1 (6.25)
Kaliyuva Makkalige Bicycle	1 (7.69)	2 (12.50)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)
Old Age Pension Scheme	3 (23.08)	1 (6.25)	4 (26.67)	2 (12.50)
Bhagyalakshmi Investment Bond	0 (0.00)	3 (18.75)	2 (13.33)	1 (6.25)
Indira Awas Yojana	4 (30.77)	5 (31.25)	3 (20.00)	0 (0.00)
Schemes of Horticulture Department	3 (23.08)	2 (12.50)	4 (26.67)	6 (18.75)
Schemes of Agriculture Department	4 (30.77)	7 (43.75)	8 (53.33)	9 (56.25)
Micro-Irrigation	0 (0.00)	1 (6.25)	3 (20.00)	5 (31.25)
Yashasvini Scheme	9 (69.23)	11 (68.75)	10 (66.67)	12 (75.00)
MGNREGS	3 (23.08)	4 (25.00)	1 (6.67)	0 (0.00)

**Note:** 1) Figures in parentheses represent percentages of beneficiary farmers in the respective size categories.  
2) MGNREGS-Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme.

**Table 4: Number of Rainfed Farm Households Getting Benefit from Government Programs in Chikkaballapur District in 2013**

Name of the Program /Scheme	Marginal Farmers	Small Farmers	Medium Farmers	Large Farmers
BPL Ration Card	19 (100.00)	15 (100.00)	13 (100.00)	2 (15.00)
APL Ration Card	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	11 (84.62)
Mid-Day Meal Scheme	4 (21.05)	2 (13.33)	3 (23.08)	1 (7.69)
Kaliyuva Makkalige Bicycle	2 (10.53)	2 (13.33)	1 (7.69)	1 (7.69)
Old Age Pension Scheme	4 (21.05)	3 (20.00)	3 (23.08)	4 (30.77)
Bhagyalakshmi Investment Bond	2 (10.53)	2 (13.33)	1 (7.69)	1 (7.69)
Indira Awaz Yojana	8 (42.11)	4 (26.67)	3 (23.08)	1 (7.69)
Schemes of Horticulture Department	2 (10.53)	3 (20.00)	1 (7.69)	4 (30.77)
Schemes of Agriculture Department	5 (26.32)	6 (40.00)	6 (46.15)	7 (53.85)
Yashasvini Scheme	12 (63.16)	10 (66.67)	7 (53.85)	9 (69.23)
MGNREGS	5 (36.84)	4 (26.67)	2 (15.38)	0 (0.00)

**Note:** 1) Figures in parentheses represent percentages of beneficiary farmers in the respective size category.  
2) MGNREGS-Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme.

**Table 5: Per Household Average Government Benefit received by Irrigated Farm Households in Chikkaballapur District in 2013 (Rs.)**

Name of the Program/Scheme	Marginal Farmers	Small Farmers	Medium Scale Farmers	Large Farmers
BPL Ration Card	6,853 (11.69)	7,143 (11.70)	6,688 (14.09)	6,614 (17.43)
APL Ration Card	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	3,604 (7.59)	3,398 (8.95)
Mid-Day Meal Scheme	1,584 (2.70)	1,584 (2.60)	1,584 (3.34)	1,584 (4.17)
Kaliyuva Makkalige Bicycle	2,750 (4.69)	2,750 (4.51)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)
Old Age Pension Scheme	6,000 (10.23)	6,000 (9.83)	6,000 (12.64)	6,000 (15.81)
Indira Awaz Yojana	4,586.75 (7.82)	4,586.75 (7.52)	45,86.75 (9.66)	0 (0.00)
Bhagyalakshmi Investment Bond	6,670.21 (11.38)	6,670.21 (10.93)	66,70.21 (14.05)	6,670.21 (17.57)
Schemes of Agriculture Department	14,240 (24.29)	16,740 (27.43)	11,140 (23.47)	8,843 (23.30)
Schemes of Horticulture Department	1,318 (2.25)	3,856 (6.32)	2,469 (5.20)	4,846 (12.77)
MGNREGA	14,625 (24.95)	11,700 (19.17)	4,725 (9.95)	0 (0.00)
<b>Total</b>	<b>58,626.96 (100.00)</b>	<b>61,029.96 (100.00)</b>	<b>47,466.96 (100.00)</b>	<b>37,955.21 (100.00)</b>

**Note:** Figures in parentheses represent percentages of benefits received by farmers in the respective size Category.

**Table 6: Per Household Average Government Benefit received by Rainfed Farm Households in Chikkaballapur District in 2013 (Rs.)**

Name of the Program/Scheme	Marginal Farmers	Small Farmers	Medium Scale Farmers	Large Farmers
BPL Ration Card	7,253 (15.62)	6,708 (15.14)	6,624 (16.53)	6,952 (19.49)
APL Ration Card	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	3,632 (10.18)
Mid-Day Meal Scheme	1,584 (3.41)	1,584 (3.57)	1,584 (3.95)	1,584 (4.44)
Kaliyuva Makkalige Bicycle	2,750 (5.92)	2,750 (6.21)	2,750 (6.86)	2,750 (7.71)
Old Age Pension Scheme	6,000 (12.92)	6,000 (13.54)	6,000 (14.97)	6,000 (16.82)
Bhagyalakshmi Investment Bond	6,670.21 (14.36)	6,670.21 (15.05)	6,670.21 (16.65)	6,670.21 (18.70)
Indira Awas Yojana	4,586.75 (9.88)	4,586.75 (10.35)	4,586.75 (11.45)	4,586.75 (12.86)
Schemes of Agriculture Department,	1,082 (2.33)	1,616 (3.65)	1,914 (4.78)	1,576 (4.42)
MGNREGA	15,600 (33.59)	13,260 (29.92)	8,285 (20.68)	0 (0.00)
Schemes of Horticulture Department	918 (1.98)	1,142 (2.58)	1,654 (4.13)	1,922 (5.39)
<b>Total</b>	<b>46,443.96 (100.00)</b>	<b>44,316.96 (100.00)</b>	<b>40,067.96 (100.00)</b>	<b>35,672.96 (100.00)</b>

**Note:** Figures in parentheses represent percentages of benefits received by farmers in the respective size.

## CONCLUSIONS

In this study access to benefits and spread of the benefits from various Government programmes is compared among irrigated area farmers and rainfed area farmers in Chikkaballapur District of Karnataka. In the study area, cent per cent of the small and marginal farmers under irrigated situation were getting benefit from BPL card. This in itself is a prima-facie indicator of receiving at least the basic food supply. Therefore, the provision of food security is adequately taken care of by the Government. While in case of rainfed situation, all marginal, small and medium scale categories of sample farm households were getting benefit from the BPL card. In nutshell, all categories of irrigated area farmers derived more benefits compared to rainfed area farmers in the study area. Although most of the households under irrigated situation were not eligible for getting benefit under programs like old age pension, BPL ration cards and IAY but they were availing benefits often by bribing to get false documents. It is necessary for the Rural Development and Panchayat Raj Department to bring out a guide book in Kannada listing all the Government programs for rural areas, by defining eligibility criteria and procedures to be followed to avail the benefits under each program. In addition to the guide book on Government programs, awareness programs regarding the procedures to be followed by farmers to avail Government benefits need to be introduced. It is essential for the farmers to be in touch with members of village panchayat, who usually know about the different Government programs and the periodic updates of budget allocation and procedures. This will empower the farmers to effectively participate in the Government programs.



## REFERENCES

1. DE GORTER, HARRY, 1993, the dynamic effects of agricultural subsidies in the United States. *Journal of Agriculture and Resource Economics*, 18 (2): 147-159.
2. DESHPANDE, R. S., 2008, rural development programmes in Karnataka: people's perception, glimpses of Indian agriculture: macro and micro aspects. Academic Foundation, 2, New Delhi.
3. GAIHA, R., 2000, Do anti poverty programmes reach the rural poor in India. *Oxford Development Studies*, 28(1), 71-95.
4. HARISHKUMAR, H. V., 2012, Livelihood Security of Farm Households under different Farming Systems in Kolar district of Karnataka-An Economic Analysis. M.Sc. (Agri.) Thesis (unpublished), University of Agricultural Sciences, Bangalore, (India).
5. MARUTI, 2008, rural development programmes in Karnataka: people's perception. M.Sc. (Agri.) Thesis, Univ. Agric. Sci., Dharwad.
6. PATIL, N., 2005, A study on knowledge, extent of participation and benefits derived by participant farmers of the watershed development programme. M.Sc. (Agri.) Thesis, Univ. Agric. Sci., Dharwad.
7. RATHORE, V. S., BURARK, S.S., JAIN, H.K., 2011, Performance of crop insurance scheme in Udaipur District of Rajasthan. *Agriculture Economic Research Review*, 24: 25-35.
8. REDDY, J., AND SHIVAJI, B., 2011, an analysis of crop insurance Utilization in Gadag district, Karnataka. *Mysore Journal Agriculture Sciences*, 44(4): 833-839.
9. SOWNDARYA, D.C., 2012, Utilization of Benefits from Governmental Programmes/Schemes by Farmers in Karnataka- An Institutional Economic Analysis. M.Sc. (Agri.) Thesis (unpublished), University of Agricultural Sciences, Bangalore, (India).

